

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/163,041

Applicant(s)

VEDITZ, DANIEL P.

Examiner

John M. Frink

Art Unit

2142

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John M. Frink.

(3) Hussein Akhavannik.

(2) Andrew Caldwell.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 33,68,75 and 96.

Identification of prior art discussed: Englander.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The 35 USC 112 rejection made in the preceding office action was discussed, as were the 35 USC 102/103 rejections. The Examiner provided additional details regarding the applicability of the Englander reference regarding claim 33. Furthermore, potential 35 USC 101 issues with regards to claims 68 and 75 were discussed; specifically, that claim 75 appears to be directed to software only, where the software is not embedded in computer readable media. Also, the differences in the scope of claims 33 and 96 were discussed. No agreement regarding patentability was made.

DRAFT
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

001

1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

Telephone
202 783-5070

Facsimile
202 783-2331

Web Site
www.fr.com

Date December 12, 2007

To John Frink

Facsimile number 571-273-9686

From Hussein Akhavannik (Reg. No. 59,347)

Re Self-contained applications applied to be received by and processed within a browser environment
Your Ref.: 09/163,041
Our Ref.: 06975-721001

Number of pages
including this page 2

Message An Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form dated December 12, 2007 is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 18, 2007

Hussein Akhavannik
Reg. No. 59,347

NOTE: This facsimile is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately call us collect at 202 783-5070 to arrange for its return. Thank you.

DRAFT**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No. : 09/163,041

First Named Applicant: Daniel P. Veditz

Examiner: Frink, John Moore

Art unit: 2142

Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:(1) Hussein Akhavannik (Reg. No. 59,347) (2) _____(3) John Frink (4) _____**Proposed Date of Interview:** December 13-21, 2007 **Proposed Time:** 10:00 EST (AM)**Type of Interview Requested:**(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference**Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ YES ☒ NO

if yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rej.	33, 46, 60, 68, 75, 85, and 96	Englander, java.sun.com	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

The amendment to claims 33, 46, 60, 68, 75, 85, and 96 and the failure of Englander and java.sun.com to describe or suggest a nested archive.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)_____
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative_____
Registration Number, if applicableAttorney Docket Number: 06975-721001
40465036.doc